

EDUNCIL COMMUNICATION

San Joaquin County's Withdrawa of Request to Serve the Community of AGENDA TITLE:

Victor With Water

MEETING DATE: December 18, 1991

PREPARED BY: Public Works Director

RECOMMENDED ACTION: This item is for information only. No action is required.

BACKGROUND **INFORMATION**: The City Council, at its meeting of November 20, 1991, took

no action on the Victor Water Service Request and continued

it until the question on CEQA requirements could be

evaluated.

The City recently received the attached letter from the County of San Joaquin withdraw ng their request for the City to supply bulk water to the community of Victor.

FUNDING: Not applicable.

Jack Rcnsko

Public Works Director

JLR/1m

Attachment

Eugene B. Delucchi, Chief Deputy Director cc:

San Joaquin County, Public Works Department

APPROVED:

THOMAS A PETERSON



COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

GEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

P.O. BOX 1810 — 1810 E. HAZELTON AVENUE
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95201
(209) 468-3000

EUGENE DELUCCHI
OMEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

THOMAS R. FLINN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

MANUEL LOPEZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

RICHARD C. PAYNE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

December 4, 1991

Mr. Jack L. Ronsko Director of Public Works City of Lodi Call Box 3906 Lodi, California 95241-1910 DEC 9 1991
CITY OF LOSI
RUBLIC WORKS DEFARTACIT

SUBJECT: SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY WATER WORKS #2 (VICTOR WATER SYSTEM)

Dear Mr. Ronsko:

At the Lodi City Council meeting of November 20th, the City Council expressed concern regarding a precedent which could be set by providing water service to the Community of Victor. Even though it appears that the majority of the Council may be receptive to the proposal, we are concerned that their interest relies only upon a substantial benefit being derived by the City of Lodi.

If the City Attorney had not questioned whether or not CEQA review was necessary, I anticipate that the Council may have conceptually approved the proposal subject to the drilling of test wells east of the City to ascertain that suitable well sites were available.

Connection to the City of Lodi is not the most cost-effective alternative for the Community of Victor. It does, however, make the best water management sense for both Victor and Lodi. Additionally, the alternative of connection to the City of Lodi requires. a total up front expenditure. The other available alternatives can be staged, easing the funding requirements for Victor.

In asking for connection to the City of Lodi, we felt that our request was reasonable; agreeing to pay the capital costs required for the Transmission Facility, deeding that facility to the City of Lodi for its future use and provision for future connections. We also agreed to pay the City's connection fees and established water rate of 150 percent of that amount charged

A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T

to city residents, even though we feel that this charge is not reasonable considering the fact that the City would not have to maintain the Distribution System.

In our opinion, the County was willing to pay more than its fair share for this interconnect. However, it appears that the City of Lodi desires an even better "deal" and final approval, if obtained, would be unacceptably delayed. The County hereby withdraws the request made on behalf of the Community of victor for water service from the City of Lodi.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE B. DELUCCHI Chief Deputy Director

EBD ad A VONNE

c: Henry M. Hirata, Director of Public Works/San Joaquin County